



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/097,035	06/12/98	KROM	J 9608042

IM22/0907

D A THOMAS  
BRIDGESTONE/FIRESTONE INC  
1200 FIRESTONE PARKWAY  
AKRON OH 44317

EXAMINER

WILSON, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1713

3

DATE MAILED:

09/07/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/097,035

Applicant(s)

Krom et al.

Examiner

D.R. Wilson

Group Art Unit

1713



☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-20 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

### ***DETAILED ACTION***

#### **1. Restriction Requirement**

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, drawn to a blended product, classified in class 525, subclass 207+.
- II. Claims 15-20, drawn to a process for forming a compatibilized blend, classified in class 525, subclass 207+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process such as mixing the two polymers in a solvent below their softening temperatures.

It has been assumed that the reaction product of Claims 2-14 are the blended product of Claim 1, although this is not clear from the language of Claim 1. If Claim 1 is meant to be the reaction product of a first and second polymer which is then blended with a second polymer, the claims should be considered as being further restricted to Group Ia, Claim 1, a blended product, and Group Ib, Claims 2-14, a reaction product, related as intermediate and final products.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

## 2. Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following genera of patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a. first polymers, and
- b. second polymers.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a **single ultimate** disclosed specie for each of the above genera for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Where specific species are not identified in the claims applicant should elect a specific specie from the specification. An alternative method of election is to identify an Example which collectively exemplifies the elected species. Currently, Claims 1 and 15-16 are generic to their respective groups.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 1713

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

### 3. Conclusion to Election/Restriction Requirement

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Mr. Daniel J. Hudak on September 2, 1999 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### 4. Future Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D.R. Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2398. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu, may be reached at (703) 308-2450.

The fax phone number is (703) 305-5408 or 5433. The after final fax number is (703) 305-3599.



D.R. WILSON  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
SECTOR 1700 - ART UNIT 1713